DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 681 SO 009 972

AUTHOR Smith, Joan K.
TITLE Progressive School Administration: Ella Flagg Young and the Chicago Schools, 1909-1915.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, New York, April 3-8, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Role; *Biographies; *Educational History; Educational Objectives; Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Females; Personal Interests; Public Schools; *School Administration; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Illinois (Chicago); Young (Ella Flagg)

ABSTRACT

Ella Flagg Young's contributions as an administrator in the Chicago public schools from 1909-15 are assessed. Intended as a profile of an administrator whose personal accomplishments broadened American education, the study is also a history of progressive and vocational education in Chicago during the early 20th century. Characterized as a woman who worked against factionalism and divisiveness, Ella Young was described by Jane Addams as possessing superior intelligence and character. The account of her life and career is based on newspaper sources, published and unpublished archival material, and manuscript collections. The study is presented in six sections. Section I describes her early background as the youngest child of hardworking parents of Scottish descent and her training as a teacher. Section II discusses her association with John Dewey at the University of Chicago Lab School from 1899-1904. In section III, the stage is set for her 1909 appointment to the superintendency of the Chicago City School System. Sections IV and V, which contain the bulk of the paper, explore the role she played during her years as head administrator of the second largest school system in the country and discuss her attempts to expand the manual arts curriculum, upgrade teacher's salaries, and provide educational opportunity for all interested students. Section VI describes her retirement years. References are included. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED139681

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Progressive School Administration: Ella Flagg Young and the Chicago Schools, 1909-1915

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joan K. Smith

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Joan K. Smith

SP 009 972

Presented before Division F, A.E.R.A.
Convention, New York City, April 4-8, 1977

Copyright © 1977 by Joan K. Smith. All rights reserved.

Progressive School Administration: Ella Flagg Young and the Chicago Schools, 1909 - 1915

> Progressivism was a mass movement which united diverse elements in American society. It transcended the agrarianism and the sectionalism of the Populists and the humanitarianism of such urban reformers as Jacob Riis and Jane Addams. It was a crusade in which farmers, wage earners, and small business men all marched shoulder to shoulder.[1]

Ella Flagg Young was a prominent figure in the turn of the century activities which historians call progressivism. In fact, she is probably the educational prototype for the era when one considers her life and career, for they bespeak the extent to which she worked in the schools against factionalism and divisiveness towards a united democratic society. It will be the purpose of this paper to (1) present her early background, (2) describe her association with John Dewey, (3) set the stage for her superintendency, (4) carefully explore the role she played in her early and (5) later years as head administrator of the second largest school system in the country, and (6) finally draw the curtain on her retirement years.

I

> The social gospel was the religious phase of the progressive movement.... Implicit in Progressive thought was the doctrine of responsibility which declared that the individual must take the consequences for his deficiencies and failures....The collectivistic tendencies of the Progressives stemmed from the doctrine of the free and autonomous individual.

The youngest of three children born to thrifty and hardworking parents of Scottish descent, Ella spent the first ten years of her life (1845-1855) fighting to gain independence from her mother's conviction that she was a "delicate child."[2] It was only after she had single-handedly persevered to teach herself to read and write that this image changed, and she was allowed to attend school. While she had a business sense like her mother, she was also like her father in several respects: they excelled in math and science; they were both avid readers; and after weighing the evidence, they were prone to independent thinking even when their conclusions were at odds with protestant doctrine. As Chicago Teachers' Federation leader Margaret Haley was to say of her later:

> Mrs. Young impressed me as one who was not inhibited as a child from responding to normal stimuli. She must have had some great advantage in her early development which made for quick translation of impressions into expressions and direct action. . . . It was a liberal education to watch her as she considered a matter and then reacted to her thought; . . . here was free play of mind in all matters.[3]

When she was thirteen her family moved to Chicago where she eventually entered the normal department, graduating two years later in 1862. For the next 15 years her professional career advanced: from elementary school teacher, principal of a newly-opened practice school, and high school math teacher to principal of one of the largest grammar schools in Chicago. During the earlier part of this period, she turned one of the toughest, most undisciplined grammar classes into one more typical in manner and achievement of regular classes. (She also married William Young, a friend of the family who was many years her senior.)[4] During the latter part of this period, while she was grammar school principal, she was known for employing the best techniques available in educational procedure. She was fond of saying that "no one can work in another's harness" and gave her teachers the freedom to devise their own methods of effective teaching. At the same time, she was conducting staff study groups in English, Greek, psychology, ethics and philosophy. During her principalship, Mayor Carter H. Harrison, Sr. remarked that he thought her school was the "most effective social institution in the city."[5]

In 1887, the year that she first addressed an all-male NEA convention (women weren't allowed on the floor) she was promoted to District Superintendent. Here she continued the same type of administrative activities that she had employed in her school. However, such was not the case in all of Chicago's districts as Joseph M. Rice found. She supported many of Rice's findings and worked hard to transform what Rice had called an "unscientific" teaching faculty.[6] The teacher institutes in her district became a popular involvement for faculty, because as members said, "She is a fascinating speaker" with a good sense of humor and the best learner in attendance.[7] These institutes heard lectures from William James, John Dewey, and James Angell, and the spirit of the group became one of championing the cause of democracy in education. In fact, it was in one of her districts that the first impulses of the Chicago Teachers Federation (CTF) were felt. Although she, at first, questioned the wisdom of such an organization (later she would say that she was not large enough to see the necessity of organizing), she was unsympathetic to the autocratic policies that produced it. By 1899 she, herself, resigned because under a new superintendent her freedom to administer her districts had been usurped. To the dismay of many teachers, including CTF leader Catharine Goggin, she resigned to take up full-time graduate work at the University of Chicago under a young professor named John Dewey.[8]

> The social planners of the Progressive Era turned their philosophy to pragmatism. They put their faith in science.. . . The plan is good which works. The pragmatism and the science worship of the Progressive Faith were veneers laid on ethical beliefs which in American history were as old as Puritanism.

By the fall of 1899 Ella Flagg Young was teaching at the university, helping reorganize Dewey's lab school, and working towards her Ph.D. In 1900 she graduated and until 1904 was on staff as a full professor. For Dewey their association brought the field of education into the realm of his budding philosophical framework, instrumentalism. For Young it gave a philosophical base to justify what she already knew experientially. Dewey's own estimation of their association is revealed in the following letter to a former student at the University of Chicago:

> In my opinion what Mrs. Young got from her study of philosophy was chiefly a specific intellectual point of view and terminology (the two things can't be separated, for terminology with a person like Mrs. Young is a very real thing, not a verbal one) in which to clear up and express the practical outcome of her prior experience and a greater intellectual assurance . . . . She had by temperament and training the gist of a concrete empirical pragmatism with reference to philosophical conceptions before the doctrine was ever formulated in print. Another thing that impressed me was her range of experience -- its scope, and her habitual attitude of openness to which would enrich it.. . . What I chiefly got from Mrs. Young was just the translation of philosophical conceptions into their empirical equivalents. More times than I could well say I didn't see the meaning of force of some favorite conception of my own till Mrs. Young had given it back to me.. . . I have hardly known anyone who made the effect of genuine intellectual development the test and criterion of the value of everything as much as she.[9]

She was the only one to write about education in the 1903 series that won the acclaim of William James, who said Chicago has "a flourishing school of radical empiricism."[10]

After a year abroad she returned in 1905 to take up the principalship of the Chicago Normal. During her four years at the normal, she reorganized the curriculum so that future teachers learned to integrate traditional subjects and utilize students' experiences for greater meaning. She brought harmony, efficiency, and unity to a formally fragmented normal staff isolated from the potpourri of city schools which it was to serve. She also generally put in to practice the pedagogical philosophy that she had learned and written about during her student years at Chicago. She cautioned future teachers to be less concerned with obedience and more concerned with understanding individual patterns. Besides stressing the individual, she also stressed content: "No one would be so rash as to claim that it makes no difference what food a child has, that the only question is how does its stomach attack the food. Yet certain educators maintain that the 'significant question in education is how children learn and not what they learn.' " The educational method of value for Young was the "scientific method applied to the art of teaching."

Her educational efforts and expertise were not just limited to those who came in contact with the Normal. In 1906 she began editing the EDUCATIONAL BI-MONTHLY -- a journal of practice in education gratuitously sent to every faculty member in the city's school system.[11]

III

> Progressivism was a movement born of hope and of disillusionment. Disillusionment came first.... The most publicized of the reforms of the Progressive Era sought to remedy defects in the working of political democracy.... [While accepting] the individualism of the gospel of wealth, ... they pointed out that [it] had been used to further selfish ends.

While Ella Flagg Young was learning and then teaching a pragmatic approach to education, the city schools were experiencing the worst decade of turbulance in their 60-year history. The biggest single change, and one which introduced a whole new element, was the growth of teacher organizations. The elementary grade teachers comprised the largest of these several groups. Organized in 1897 as the Chicago Teachers' Federation (CTF) and under the leadership of Catharine Goggin and Margaret Haley, these teachers had wanted to democratically express their views and work for majority decisions and better teaching conditions. By 1898 they had successfully sponsored legislation for a voluntary pension plan, had petitioned and been granted a higher salary schedule by the school board, and were working on a bill that would change the voluntary pension donations to compulsory contributions. By fall of 1899, the board was pleading insufficient funds for the 1900 salary schedule and was planning to rescind the remaining 1899 advances. CTF leaders Haley and Goggin discovered, rather accidentally, a way to increase the revenue: in the true spirit of progressive social reform, they were going to take the large tax dodging city corporations to court and force them to pay what they should have been paying on their tangible assets all along.[12] From January, 1900, until June, 1906, CTF lawyers Isiah T. Greenacre and later Clarence Darrow waged their court battles with corporate counsels. The six-and-a-half years were wrought with struggle after struggle: the corporate counsels used delay tactics, bribery, mandamus and injunction suits, and appeals when decisions in lower courts were rendered in favor of paying taxes. Finally, in 1902 when the tax amount, which had been cut from $2,300,000 to $600,000, was going to be paid to the city treasurer for the school fund, the board of education voted not to pay the 1900 salary increases, but to use the money for building and maintenance. The CTF lawyers issued an injunction against the treasurer's office, and two years later won the money for the teachers only to have board lawyers appeal the decision. The CTF leaders entered city politics: they campaigned for a "fair-minded" reform mayor whose responsibility would be to appoint "fair-minded" reform board members. By June 1906 such a mayor, former judge Edward Dunne, and his predominantly new board voted to pay the teachers their back salary increases.

This struggle had further repercussions for the teacher corps. The corporate structure sponsored a bill removing the compulsory clause of the pension fund making the pension system ineffectual. In 1901 the bill passed. In July 1902, the school board adopted Superintendent Edwin G. Cooley's merit plan with its accompanying secret marking system. The essential characteristics of this plan were: 1) on a 10 level salary schedule teachers could advance automatically to level 7 as long as their annual efficiency ratings (secretly done sometime during the year by the principal, district superintendent or a combination of both) were at least 70%; 2) with an efficiency score of 80% teachers would be allowed to retake their certification test whereupon a score of 80% would allow them to advance to level 8 and then to 9 and 10. Such board policies were creating so many internal conflicts and suspicions that Haley feared for the survival of the CTF. It was under these clouds of an ineffective pension plan and a secret marking system that a disillusioned CTF turned to what appeared to be a fair weather friend-the Chicago Federation of Labor. At the teachers' October 1902 monthly meeting a letter of sympathy was read from the CF of L encouraging them to come to a meeting and tell their story to their 200,000 voting men. With encouragement from Jane Addams (who said she, herself, was a member of several labor unions), the CTF voted to affiliate with the CF of L.[14] By 1905 of the 2600 teachers who were eligible for level 10, only 61 were receiving that top level salary. For most teachers level 7 was the limit, and it dated back 20 years as a top salary.

Early in 1906, with one third of the board being Dunne appointees and another one third about to be appointed by Dunne, Superintendent Cooley designed a modified merit plan for the board's subsequent approval. Essentially, this plan allowed 5 courses of 36 hours each to be substituted for the reexamination. Before submitting it to the board, however, he asked school board business management Chairman Jane Addams (a Dunne appointee) what she thought of it. Addams in turn called Haley, Young and another Dunne appointee, Dr. Cornelia DeBey, to Hull House to see what they thought of it. Before taking a look at it, all three women concurred that Addams should submit it to the teaching corps for their approval. She agreed to do so, although she was worried about Cooley's reaction. Jane Addams was a great social reformer with great compassion for the downtrodden, but when confronted with friction and conflict she had little stamina in the face of authority. Cooley refused Addams' request and Addams dropped the matter. Later Ella Flagg Young said that "Miss Addams was wholly unfit to cope with Mr. Cooley and ought not either to go alone or be sent alone to put such matters to him, because she always lost out."[15] When the board convened to vote on the plan certain board rules had to be suspended to accomplish voting on it at that meeting. Jane Addams not only voted to suspend the rules, but also voted for the plan. In both cases hers was the deciding vote.

By spring, however, more Dunne reinforcements joined the board. After a thorough investigation of the marking system in which unfair and discriminatory practices were revealed, the so-called merit system in both its forms was abolished in favor of a fairer system. The latter called for teachers to be openly rated as either efficient or inefficient in which case their recourse lay in a hearing before the board after a probationary period.[16]

The peace between school board and teachers was of short duration. In 1907 Dunne failed reelection and, when the new mayor, Fred Busse, extracted all but a handful of Dunne's appointees, two consequences followed: Once again with the reluctant cooperation of Business Management Chairman Addams, board President Otto C. Schneider tried to interfere with and control the selection of teacher representatives to the teacher pension trustee board; and the modified Cooley plan was reinstated.[17]

The teachers, with the CTF at the helm, outmaneuvered such policies, elected their own pension trustees, and advanced almost 2000 teachers (who enrolled in 5 courses simultaneously from the Art Institute) to level 8. Cooley and Schneider were furious, but they were also battlefatigued. Cooley, who was known to be suffering from severe headaches, removed the Art Institute from the accredited list, and he also removed himself from the battle. In March 1909 he resigned giving ill health as his reason. He accepted the presidency of the D.C. Heath Company.[18] The teaching corps was not surprised at his choice. They had felt his publishing connections earlier when a great majority of them had tried unsuccessfully to remove from usage certain inadequate texts.

When Cooley left in March there were no victors and both sides were splintering badly. Board members were fighting among themselves and teachers who had not completed their 5 courses before the Institute was disacredited were bitter. There was so much internal strife that it took the board five months to decide on Cooley's replacement. The greatest of pragmatists would have found challenge in uniting such a fragmented and splintered group. On July 23 the national wire services carried the news that the Chicago Board of Education had unanimously on the second ballot elected Dr. Ella Flagg Young. It was the first time a woman had ever been elected to head a large city school system.[19] The challenge was hers, and she eagerly accepted it. The board instigated another precedent by creating the new position of Assistant Superintendent. It was designed to be a grooming place for future superintendents. Vacation school supervisor John D. Shoop was elected to the new position.

IV

> It was also an attempt to create a bright new world. . . . It was frankly humanistic. The progressive leaders took for granted the power and dignity of man. The optimistic doctrine of . . . progressivism was a conscious effort of the first American generation of the twentieth century to save itself.
>
> An age is known by its catchwords. One of the most important among those of the Progressive Era was "efficiency." . . . The use of the expert [was demanded] in government if politics were to be made efficient; . . . the expert became an administrator of policy as well as a fact gatherer. The phenomenon of administrative law appeared in American life.

In the month following her election Superintendent Young announced that "democratic efficiency" was to be the keynote to her administration. "There is to be but one head of the schools of Chicago. I am it." She announced firmly that "whenever I find that I cannot have complete charge of the educational end of the school system, I will quit. I cannot carry out my ideas unless I am given control of affairs."[20] Twice during her six-and-one-half year administration she would find herself complying with the above declaration.

An amazing degree of harmony existed among the various constituencies almost from the first day she took office. Considering the divisiveness that had existed, it is surprising that such a measure of unity was accomplished so quickly. But there were reasons. First, the 21-member make-up of the board changed by seven that summer. Otto C. Schneider conceded the Presidency to Armour and Company's lawyer Alfred Urion who was unanimously elected by the board. Secondly, the board was anxious to restore harmony to the school operations, and they knew they had to choose a superintendent whom the teaching corps trusted. Young, it was said, knew the names of all 6,000 teachers in the system, and if given the freedom to run the schools she felt she could restore their confidence. Thirdly, they needed someone who knew how to deal with the CTF. When Ella was asked how she would do this, she said that she would treat them like an "educational institution." Fourthly, Cooley had isolated himself from the teachers to the extent that many resented it. One of the first things that the new superintendent did was to abolish the secret markings and modified Cooley plan and announce that her door would always be open, with or without appointment, to any and all teachers. She also called attention to the need for a better (more universal) system for collecting factual information on the schools. She recommended a higher and more stable salary schedule for the teachers and began revising the course of study. Principals and teachers were involved in the revisions at all levels.[21]

Consequently, with board and teacher support her first 2½ years were filled with accomplishments. They witnessed an expansion of the manual arts curriculum at all levels of schooling. Superintendent Young succeeded in making these programs, along with the academic side, available to all students who were interested in them. For example, at the elementary level the course of study looked very similar to those offered earlier in Parker's and Dewey's schools and in her own organization of practice schools at the Chicago Normal. As much as possible the subjects in the course of study were tied to first-hand experiences through field trips, handcrafts and other self-expressive activities. Elementary school administration was geared to individual differences. "Science," she stated in her annual report, "has shown us that all minds don't like Greek."[22] However, traditional content was not neglected; instead it was incorporated in a (hopefully) more meaningful way to the student. In each grammar school a room to be equipped with manual arts materials was planned for the grammar (upper) grades. Students in grades six through eight could choose between the original general course and a new industrial one, so that they could be better suited to their courses in high school or their trades after grammar graduation--again, the effort was to recognize individual differences in types of minds.

At the secondary level, two-year vocational courses were made available to every high school student. These courses covered the following areas: 1) accounting; 2) stenography; 3) mechanical drawing; 4) design; 5) advanced carpentry; 6) patternmaking; 7) machine-shop work; 8) electricity; and 9) household arts. Students could receive credit towards graduation from the four year course at the two technical high schools in the city. Plans were in operation for a girls vocational high school. This was opened as the Lucy Flowers High School in 1912.

At her suggestion the board of education approved programs in ethics and morality. Until then, character building had largely been taught through reasoning and reading. She felt that the best way to teach the subject was not through recitation and exercises on moral lessons nor role playing but through "duties and responsibilities whose significance is interpreted in activities natural to childhood."[23] She also recommended that sex hygiene classes be implemented in the high schools. Known as personal purity, the first classes were given during the fall of 1912 by male and female doctors to boys and girls in segregated classes.

At the suggestion of one of the board members penny lunches were started in all of the grammar schools. The preparation of such lunches became part of the household arts curriculum for the upper grammar grades.[24] In 1910 line staff relations were cemented even more as board members, principals and teachers united behind the candidacy of Superintendent Young and successfully "boomed" her to the NEA presidency. She had their much needed support throughout her year as the first female to head up the NEA.[25]

There were a couple of rough spots in this 2½ year period. The teachers received a salary increase for the 1910-1911 and 1912-1913 school years, but throughout the 1911-1912 school year the board pleaded lack of funds. Mrs. Young still lamented low salaries, however, in her annual reports. High school sororities and fraternities had evoked enough public hostility to force the board to adopt rules designed to eliminate them. They were hard to destroy, because they tended to go underground and become secretive. Some parents favored their continuation. Mrs. Young was, however, responsible for enforcing the board rule.

By winter, 1911-12 a new mayor, Carter H. Harrison, Jr., had appointed a new board under different leadership, and it was changing its relationship to the superintendent even though it had reelected her and Shoop. The new policy was to create special committees to which the superintendent's recommendations were referred before the board considered them. In February 1912 Margaret Haley was campaigning for woman suffrage in the Western states when she received a letter from Catharine Goggin. "Mrs. Young feels a little anxious," wrote Catharine and she outlined why: first, because of its new committees the board had not given the superintendent the same endorsement that she felt it had in the past; second, salaries had been approved, without her consultation; and third, three of her recommendations for principalships had recently been turned down. Catharine went on, "I know . . . that the superintendent has been troubled by [these] new developments."[26]

By early summer 1912 rumors were developing that Mayor Harrison, Jr. no longer supported

her policies. To set the matter straight the mayor wrote to her assuring her that he did support her and asked her to ignore the empty rumors. She acknowledged her appreciation of his support, told him she had ignored the rumors, and wished his administration well.[27]

By the end of July Mayor Harrison had appointed eight school board members. Four were reappointed and four were new. One of the new board members was a lawyer named William Rothmann. He had served as chairman of the police pension fund under two previous mayors at the time that this fund's interest had been found missing. For the seven years of his chairmanship, the annual $20,000 interest was never deposited. A commission headed by Alderman Charles E. Merriam investigated the fund and discovered this abuse. The episode was never mentioned by most newspapers and Rothmann quietly resigned. The commission informally concluded that the interest was not pocketed but rather fed into the political machinery. This appointment would turn out not to set well with the CTF. Shortly, he would also become chairman of the board of education finance committee.[28]

The fall proceeded much the same as before. Special committees were appointed, and the superintendent's recommendations for a new series of readers was not approved. At the first December 1912 board meeting, however, Mrs. Young and Mr. Shoop were unanimously reelected to their respective positions of superintendent and assistant superintendent. By the second December board meeting the biggest windstorm to date hit: the board took the course of study out of her hands, because there were too many "fads and frills" in the elementary curriculum such as sewing and other handwork. They appointed another special committee to look into a revision that would remove the frills and emphasize the "three R's." Young was visibly upset. "Everytime I start to do anything," she said, "a committee is appointed to take the work out of my hands. It makes one wonder," she continued, "if one can accomplish anything."[29] It must have been quite a blow to her to hear talk of abolishing the very activities that she felt made the academic basics more meaningful to students.

A second important board appointment came in January. A real estate agent named Jacob Loeb was named to fill the vacancy left by death. Also during late winter and early spring two bills concerning the teachers' pension board were written. One came from the school board and provided for the following: 1) that the trustee make-up should be four board members, four teachers, and the superintendent as ex-officio; 2) that the finance committee chairman should be head of the pension board; and 3) that the board should be compelled to match the teachers' contributions dollar for dollar with an option to double it. (At present they were only required to match the interest with an option to match the teachers' contributions as well.) The other bill was a retaliatory effort from the CTF. It maintained provisions in the 1907 bill--membership of six teachers to three board representatives and the compulsory interest matching clause. The superintendent supported the board's bill because it would increase pension revenue.[30] The CTF, however, had wanted a better compulsory revenue clause but not at the expense of the teacher-board ratio. Haley approached Young, asking the superintendent if the board would ever approve a dollar for dollar clause. The superintendent said she thought so if the representation was more even. She told Haley that she had originally told

the board in her July 1909 interview that she would try to do this. Haley looked a little surprised and disappointed, but they both agreed that the teachers would have to decide.

At the next school board meeting teacher representatives, including Goggin and Haley, were invited to attend. Rothmann and Urion explained the board's pension bill. Rothmann--who as chairman of the finance committee would head the pension board under Urion's plan--was strongly in favor of the measure. Urion asked the teachers' representatives what they thought. A couple of them said they approved but most said they would not presume to speak for the teaching corps. Rothmann then said that they would put it to a vote of all the teachers. Upon leaving Haley commended Rothamnn and promised not to try to sway the teachers one way or another. Then, he smiled "devilishly" and told her that by not disapproving she had already approved of the bill. Margaret Haley did not understand this. She started asking questions about this Rothmann and discovered what the Merriam commission had found out. She set about documenting the evidence, and printing it up so that it could be circulated at the next CTF meeting.

When the circulars were distributed at the meeting, there were many questions. The CTF decided to hold a mass meeting where questions could be answered and Rothmann could even defend himself if he was so inclined. It was scheduled for a Thursday after school. It opened in chaos. The acting chairman--William B. Owen, Ella's successor at the Normal--could hardly get the meeting called to order. Finally, he established order, but both Haley and Young asked for the floor at the same time. Owen did not know whom to recognize, so he asked the pleasure of the convention. "Amidst the cries of 'let her speak' " and " 'no, no, no,' [the superintendent] left the [room] because she thought she had been denied the floor." Owen sent a messenger after her and upon her return she was granted the floor.

> I was pleased when this meeting was called today. I felt sure of you. I thought you would not give yourselves and me a black eye the first thing. You are so primed with this you cannot think of anything else. Nevertheless, it will be all right.
>
> There are several points I want to make . . . with regard to the reason why in the beginning I was in favor of this bill. . . . Mr. Urion summoned me to his office and said he wished to talk with me about the pension and he said, "Now, you can, so far as I am concerned, you can swing things in the educational line department your own way, with the exception of . . . [the pension] and . . . I am going to do something.
>
> . . . Now, in regard to the chairmanship of the Board of Trustees. I have gone into that matter quite fully. I know that many of you under the leadership of Miss Haley and Miss Goggin know a great deal more about city government than most any other body of teachers in this country. I am not going to take time and be called to order by the chairman but will say that one of the greatest pleasures to me in coming back to the teaching force was in meeting the teachers and finding the condition of affairs, and I knew that it had come through the direction of the Federation, --and yet, with all that, here I am differing today with your leaders on the question of the chairman of the committee on finance of the Board of Education. You know that in the past the treasurers of city, of county and of state funds held their right to take the

> interest, and it is only in the last few years that reforms in government have come forward and established the fact that they have no right to the interest, although there are still those who hold that since those treasurers take care of the money and run the risk of the care and furnish large bonds, that they have a right to the interest. I don't take any stock in that at all. . . . If I had found that Mr. Rothmann was not what we mean by the word "responsible," I would have stood one minute here in his--I cannot say defense, but in explanation of his connection with the pension board.[31]

Rothmann never arrived. Margaret Haley answered questions and so did Charles Merriam who did come. The meeting was dismissed. When the teachers voted, their preference was against the Urion Bill. Out of 5,500 pension fund contributors the vote was 1683 to 1397, and downstate the pension bill became law. Mrs. Young lost and, what was worse, looked like she had been pitted against the teachers.

Up until this time her open door policy had seemed to keep her in tune with teachers' sentiment, but now she felt more isolated. She lamented this in her 1913 annual report and called for the adoption of teachers' councils. These would meet on a monthly basis during school hours. Teachers could express their views and make suggestions for her to consider and recommend. It was a natural move for her to make, since she had originated the idea and given it full expression in her Ph.D. dissertation.[32] They were to start in the fall 1913, but that spring and summer it looked like they would be starting without her.

In June, board members began openly expressing hostility toward her. Rothmann pestered her seeking favors such as wanting her to demote certain CTF teachers, but she always refused. John C. Harding was upset, because she ignored his choice of spellers. In June Mayor Harrison wrote her another letter of support, to squelch new rumors. It helped, and so did the fact that the new board president, Peter Reinberg, supported her; but hostility from other board members persisted. Loeb was becoming a cohort of Rothmann's in his bullying tactics.[33] On June 27, under Governor Dunne, former Chicago mayor, the Illinois women got the franchise. An article in the Chicago Record Herald pictured Ella Flagg Young with Jane Addams and Julia Lathrop--a social reformer. The caption read "Three Reasons Why Illinois Women Won the Vote First," but it was little comfort to the problems she faced. By the end of July she had made up her mind to resign and submitted her letter to the board president. She told newspaper reporters that she "was the victim of political intrigue among board members." The interview quoted her as saying "that her retention of the superintendency would impair the efficiency of the schools."

Former member of the board Dr. Cornelia DeBey told reporters that it was due to actions "of a lot of cheap politicians and the board. We women won't stand for it," but two other board members said they were sure that the board would accept her resignation.[34] President Reinberg said he would resign if the action was approved. Another board member, William Vincent, alluded to some of her difficulties with three of the board members. One board member said Vincent, "spoke unpardonably about her." "Someone else," he continued, "whose grammar isn't any good tried to

tell Ella Flagg Young how to teach spelling. Another who pretends to be her friend has secretly and publicly antagonized her and her views." "It's too bad," said Vincent, "but it's the only thing she can do to save her self-respect."[35]

Events of the next few days, however, changed things. A delegation of women arrived at the mayor's office to enlist his help in stopping this action; the mayor wrote to the superintendent urging her to reconsider and stay as head of schools; and he apprised her of his three new board appointments--Mrs. Gertrude Britton, Mrs. Florence Vosbrink, and Dr. Peter Clemenson. On July 30 the board met to take action and voted fourteen to one to retain her. (Harding voted against her.) That meant that since both Rothmann and Loeb were there, they had voted to retain her. She was encouraged. "I shall abide by the action of the board of education," she told newspapers. "It will still be my aim to make the Chicago public schools the embodiment of the thought and endeavor of the board and of Chicago herself for the children. The kind words of parents and teachers have touched me deeply." Mayor Harrison announced "her rule should be unopposed in all matters pertaining to the schools."[36]

The fall term went smoothly, but all it meant was that her antagonizers had gone underground. On December 10 the board convened to take up the reelection of superintendent and assistant. A Mrs. MacMahon moved that "Mrs. Ella Flagg Young be reelected Superintendent of Schools to succeed herself." It was seconded. Then, carrying out what had been a well-kept secret plan, Mr. Harding nominated John D. Shoop to the position of superintendent. The vote was taken. One member was absent. Out of twenty votes, each received ten. It took eleven to elect a superintendent. Young was shocked. She had not expected this.

> I think that everyone here will bear me out in the statement that the duties of the Superintendent properly administered need all the strength and support of the Board; that a Superintendent who needs more than one ballot to be elected has not that support and I therefore withdraw my name from the ballot.[37]

Sinking down into her chair exhausted Mrs. Young sat dazed. Tears filled her eyes and in a trembling voice she refused the requests of friends sitting at her side to have her name reconsidered.

Dr. Clemenson said he thought it would be a great calamity for her to do that. Mrs. Young said: "I took the action of the Board last July in good faith. I find I misunderstood that action. When one finds a mistake has been made the thing to do is to rectify it. I withdraw my name as a candidate. Nothing could permit me allowing my name to be used for the superintendency."[38] Several people presented motions to defer the election for two weeks, but no action was taken. Harding moved they go on with the election. Mrs. Young asked to leave, since she did not see why she should be subjected to further discussion. She went to her office and started packing. The vote was taken. Mr. Shoop received eleven votes; Mrs. Young five; four abstained. The former superintendent finished packing and went home.[39]

> The practical consequence of this optimistic doctrine of man was an unshakable confidence in the democratic process. Wilson epitomized the political problem of the Progressive Era when he pointed out that the monopolist had created an "invisible empire . . . above the forms of democracy." A minority had usurped control of the nation. The task of the reformer was to return their government to the people, . . . to remedy defects in the working of political democracy.

In order to better understand the next series of events, as well as those that have just preceeded, a word about the school board and its relationship to politics is appropriate. Members of the board were appointed by the mayor and approved by city council. It was always good strategy to appoint a representation of the various ethnic, labor and business interests of the city. This was not the easiest accomplishment, nor did it enhance the board's smoothness of operation. Chicago's 2,388,500 population particularly encompassed German, Bohemian, Irish, Jewish, Protestant, Catholic, big business, small business and labor. Women, too, were insisting on a voice in decision making. It was not a cohesive group, but instead frictions and suspicions existed among them. The board appointments also represented a wide range of educational backgrounds. Sometimes personal biases concerning board members' own educational experiences intervened in school board policy. Then, too, motivations for accepting the appointment varied. The valuable school lands intrigued some realtors; pension funds interested other people; a budget of over $10,000,000 annually represented a chance for power to some. The rationales for personal gain were endless.[40]

There were many spirited and right-minded people who served on the boards and served well. It took only a few of the petty, more mundane motivations to destroy a harmonious operation. The appointees were choices of the mayor, usually after he had consulted the wishes of the group to be represented. He could often intercede in times of discord (as Harrison did with Ella), and peace would usually prevail. This was true as long as the mayor's authority was backed by public sentiment. However, when his popularity was dwindling his intervention was less effective. The mayor could not remove any board member without resignations. If his political strength waned, the pettiness of power struggles would creep back into the educational decision-making process.

Mayor Harrison was quite upset with his board. He had publicly pledged Mrs. Young his full support, and he expected the board to honor that pledge. He had asked them to conduct an open ballot election, and they had even managed to ignore that request. Mrs. Britton, one of Mrs. Young's board supporters, told Mayor Harrison that she had gotten wind of the move to oust her a few minutes before the December 10 board convened. There was no time to really plan a retaliating move. On December 11 Harrison stated publicly that he regretted seeing Mrs. Young leave the schools in such a manner. A delegation of women led by Mrs. George Bass, President of the Women's Club, and

Miss Jane Addams visited the mayor. During the conference they expressed shock at such a disreputable act and told him of their plans for a mass protest meeting to be scheduled December 13. The mayor said that before he had appointed five of the current members, he had asked for updated letters of resignation from them to be used, if necessary, at his discretion. Harrison told the women he was now going to accept these five and push for the resignations of others who had been antagonistic to Mrs. Young. (He held Harding's letter but not Loeb's or Rothmann's.) "I wrote personally to each member and requested Mrs. Young's reelection," he said. "This is the one thing in my administration that has, to use the language of the streets, 'got my goat.'"[41]

In such circumstances it was incumbent on Mr. Shoop to resign, Harrison told the ladies. He believed it would be legally impossible to reinstate Mrs. Young without this. The women planned to work toward this end. Shoop, himself, refused to comment on the mayor's advice to the women, but Young said this:

> As I see it what the women want to do is impossible. Under the pension law with which I am familiar it's impossible to remove Mr. Shoop. He is legally elected and it would, therefore, be impossible to remove him from a higher position to a lower position without a trial for just cause, since his term of service entitles him to the benefits of the pension law. Since he has been in office only a while it will be impossible for him to do anything in so short a time to merit trial or reduction in rank.

"Mr. Shoop has been waiting for that position for three years," she added. "He was never in harmony with me or my policies." When asked about her future she said "I have accepted a position to take care of the educational department of the CHICAGO TRIBUNE." To the question of whether she expected the board's action she answered, "On the contrary, I was never so astonished in all my life."[42]

The five deposed board members made little comment except to say that they would probably bring legal action against the mayor in order to be reinstated. They generally concurred in the feeling that the action was unjust. Harding expressed the most hostility to Mrs. Young, accusing her of playing politics and being a poor loser.[43]

Meetings all over the city were planned and held. The executive committee of the Socialist party adopted resolutions favoring Mrs. Young's speedy return. Similar resolutions were adopted by the Chicago Political Equality League, the Woman's Association of Commerce of Chicago, Woman's Trade Union League, and the Sunday Evening Club. Even the leading men of the city voted to join the women in calling for the restoration of Mrs. Young.[44] Mrs. Britton and Dr. Cornelia DeBey made statements attesting to the fact that a plot to oust the superintendent was underway before the board meeting of December 10. Mrs. Britton mentioned seeing Dr. DeBey in the board room offices prior to the meeting. DeBey told her that she had received word of the plot on good authority, and she had just told the board president. DeBey wrote the INTER-OCEAN as follows:

"After leaving President Reinberg's office, I went direct to Mr. Shoop's office and gave him my information. I said: 'Mr. Shoop, you have the chance of your life. Do you believe that Mrs. Young is a better educator than you; He replied: 'I do.' 'Well, they are going to elect you this afternoon as superintendent of schools. Either Mr. Sethness or Mr. Harding will nominate you. Take my advice and show your good judgment and common sense by refusing to stand and be made a tool.'

"He replied: 'You don't think I could fill the office?' 'No, I do not,' I replied. 'Well, you don't give a man a show,' he said. 'I do.' I told him, 'that is why I am coming to you now. You may depend upon it, you will never be retained any length of time. Only as you take orders will you last. Keep what you have, play fair and be a man.'

"His reply was: 'I won't do it. I know nothing.' 'Yes, you do know. I can tell by your manner that you know, and even so, you know now. What I tell you is the absolute truth. Mr. Sethness or Mr. Harding will nominate you and give you the chance of your life to show that you care for the schools and are an honorable man.'

"This is the substance and exact statement of what I said to Mr. John Shoop on Wednesday last."

Cornelia DeBey[45]

The Lieutenant Governor of Illinois suggested that the city's children strike the schools as a form of protest. The teachers in the Lucy Flower Technical School joined the Chicago Political Equality League saying that the resignation of Mrs. Young made suffragists out of them. The president of the Cook County Woman's Party suggested that a procession of mothers, fathers, and children be planned as a protest. Margaret Haley said that she was going to offer a resolution to the governor and the legislature which would take the school board out of the hands of politicians and make the offices elective.

By far the biggest protest meeting to be held was the one to which Mrs. Bass referred at the mayor's office. It was held during the day on Saturday, December 13 at the Auditorium Theatre. Organized and conducted by Mrs. Bass, it was attended by 2000 parents, teachers and leading citizens.[46] The speakers included Miss Harriet Vittum, president of the Women's City Club, Mrs. Harriet Taylor Treadwell, president of the Political Equality League, Mrs. John MacMahon, Mrs. Young's friend and staunch supporter on the school board, Alderman J. H. Lawley, Professor George H. Mead, former University of Chicago colleague, Miss Jane Addams and Miss Margaret Haley. Mrs. Bass also read a letter from the mayor which reiterated his support and his actions in removing the five board members. After all speakers were given five minutes each, in which to present their views of support for Mrs. Young and condemnation for the board's actions, Mrs. Bass presented resolutions, prepared by the planning committee and to be voted upon by the membership. The first resolution called for the resignation of John D. Shoop. It said that since he was accused of being part of the secret ballot plot to oust Mrs. Young, his resignation would be the only way to clear his name. After the resolution was read John Harding appeared asking to speak. Amidst hoots, hisses, and jeers, he demanded that he had a right to speak. He was given three minutes in which he stated that there was nothing

wrong with what the board did. He said that during the Dunne administration, several of the members got together and agreed not to vote for anyone in order to prohibit the reelection of Cooley. One of the members who had previously agreed to do this, changed his mind at the last minute so that Cooley received his necessary eleven votes. Harding's point was that there was a precedent for part of the board to meet in secret and agree on actions prior to board meetings. When Harding's three minutes were up, two minutes were given to Alderman Lawley who said that the city council supported the resolution. The vote was called, and the resolution was unanimously adopted.

The second resolution also carried unanimously; it called for the mayor to restore Mrs. Young. The third called for the ousting of William Rothmann and John Sonsteby, a labor representative on the board. Some expressed concern over the inclusion of Sonsteby. Haley rose and stated that she knew he had harrassed Mrs. Young as much as Harding or Rothmann had done. This was the first time such information had been exposed. Many were reluctant to cast Sonsteby with Rothmann without more evidence, but the resolution was approved anyway. Sonsteby's roll in this was never made clear by either Miss Haley, Mrs. Young, or the newspapers. (The HERALD did make some allusion to his unsuccessfully pressuring her to recommend raises for the manual training teachers.)[47] Both Rothmann and Sonsteby had criticized her, and Sonsteby admitted voting against her. Loeb, however, decided not to openly oppose Mayor Harrison or the superintendent. He assumed a position of supporting her throughout this fight, but he would later turn out to be most troublesome to the teachers.[48]

The mayor and the women's delegation followed through with their plans. The mayor set about looking for new members. He found the following four: John Metz, president of the Carpenter's District Council; John Eckhart, flour merchant; Joseph Holpuch, a building contractor; and Axel Strom, businessman. The fifth letter of resignation was not accepted after that person pledged to support Mrs. Young.

In the meantime the delegation of women called on Mr. Shoop to request his resignation. He met with the group and listened to them but said that it was not his decision to make; it was the board's. Thus, he said that he did not have plans to resign. Richard Folsom, school counsel, said that the board did not need his resignation to legally proceed for two reasons: first, the board can always legally reconsider a secret ballot vote; and second, the December 10 action was illegal because no time limit was put on Shoop's term in office.

So with Counselor Richard Folsom as advisor President Reinberg called a board meeting to order at 2:30 in the afternoon two days before Christmas. The four ousted members were not seated. Both Sonsteby and Rothmann tried to have their names read into the roll call, but they failed. They were read into the minutes as being present, however. There ensued a good bit of commotion as to how to correctly proceed. Finally, the new members were officially seated and the roll was called for them. The following excerpts from an INTER-OCEAN report gives a good idea of the tone of the meeting:

"I demand to be recorded as present," shouted Mr. Harding.

He was followed in quick succession by like demands from Mr. Huttmann, Mr. Sethness and Mr. Dibelka.

"I make a point of order," said Mr. Sonsteby, looking at a sheet of paper in his hand.

"I'm still a member of this board," called Mr. Sethness.

"I desire to ask if this is an adjourned meeting," said Mr. Sonsteby. "I want to ask Mr. Shoop if he has accepted the superintendency of schools."

Mr. Loeb rose to make a point of order.

"I have the floor," said Mr. Sonsteby.

"Yes, and don't give it up " shouted Mr. Harding . . .

The president was busy pounding with his gavel, which he reduced to splinters in a few minutes, but without bringing order . . .

The voice of the secretary droned slowly and was heard at intervals.

"Oh, Mr. President, you've got to recognize me, I say," shouted Mr. Sonsteby.

Mr. Sonsteby moved into the center aisle, and shaking his finger under the secretary's nose, demanded that he "shut up."

"You've been a friend of mine, but you dare to insult me–a member of this board–in this way, and I'll refer charges against you before the Civil Service Commission." The secretary's voice continued in droning tones. [The secretary was reading a letter from the city clerk stating that the four new members were legally qualified.]

The secretary finished reading the letter. On a vote to accept it, the four ousted men demanded to cast ballots. The president ruled against them . . .

Mr. Harding, furious with anger, rushed from his seat to the president's desk and stuttered a demand to be heard . . .

"I want to tell you, Peter Reinberg and Lewis Larson, that the people of Chicago are awake as they never were before and they won't stand for what you are doing here. Mayor Harrison has been carried away by a bunch of women who he thinks represent Chicago."

The president sat still in his seat, permitting Mr. Harding to continue. In the hallway stood several husky policemen, but no move was made to call them into the room to quell the disturbance.

Mrs. McMahon arose in her seat and the president recognized her.

This created a furor of excitement among the Sonsteby-Rothmann crowd, all of whom were on their feet yelling for recognition . . .

Mr. Harding got to his feet to yell that Mr. Loeb was admirably fitted to be president of a monkeys' club.

"Mrs. McMahon has the floor," said the president as he pecked on the table with a piece of gavel . . .

"Mr. President, I move you -- " began Mrs. McMahon.

"Oh, no," shouted Mr. Rothmann.

"that we reconsider the vote -- " continued Mrs. McMahon.

"I rise to a question of personal privilege," said Mr. Sonsteby.

"I want to be heard," said Mr. Harding.

"Me, too," said Mr. Sethness.

" -- by which we elected -- " said Mrs. McMahon.

"I object, I object," said Mr. Sonsteby.

"Point of order, Mr. President," shouted Mr. Harding.

" — a superintendent two weeks ago," finished Mrs. McMahon . . .

[More shouting and interjections followed, during the roll call which resulted in reconsideration and Mrs. Young's reelection. The motion to reelect her was made by Loeb and seconded by Smietanka.]

Up to the last minute of the session the tumult and noise continued. The secretary was threatened with a dozen dire consequences for persisting in calling the roll while either Mr. Sonsteby, Mr. Rothmann or one of the ousted members tried to make a speech . . .

Mr. Sonsteby charged Mr. Loeb and Mr. Lipsky with going back on their word and having agreed to vote for Mr. Shoop.

"It is no use of answering a liar," said Mr. Loeb . . .

Amid hoots and shouts of "steam rooler" the board adjourned . . .[50]

The final vote was thirteen for Mrs. Young. Four members refused to vote, and three were excused from voting. President Reinberg proudly annouced that Mrs. Young was elected. The vote for Shoop for first assistant resulted in the same count as that for superintendent. Both Young and Shoop accepted their old posts, and school administration began functioning just in time to see the schools open after the holiday break. Through a series of legal appeals, the ousted members were finally reinstated by May 1914. Their original terms, however, expired shortly after they were reseated.[51]

The time from January 1914 to December 1915 moved along without the personal struggles of the previous year but also without the triumphs and unity of the early two years under the first school board that unanimously elected her and then returned her twice. It was a somewhat uneasy alliance even though she was reelected in December 1914 by a 14 majority vote. Still, she was able to continue her original policies, and she even managed to get a 5% salary increase through the board for the teachers.[52] The same board members who had refused to vote for her return smoldered. Her opponents on the board resented the restraint placed upon them by the mayor, and they blamed his long arm of control and the CTF for her reelection. Loeb--by now a dominant force on the board--voted for Mrs. Young and publicly supported her, but he resented the CTF's power, too. As long as Mrs. Young remained in office, he was somewhat careful in his overt activities, but when the approach of her retirement became fairly obvious, so did his motives.

Ella had planned to resign by July 1, 1915 to go into retirement. However, she decided to remain until a new budget deficit and threat of salary decrease was cleared. She scrutinized the budget until she found ways to trim it down so that the teachers would not suffer. It worked, and Loeb's threatened salary cut did not go into effect.[53]

Toward the end of August 1915, she went on vacation, and while she was gone, the board met. Loeb presented a ruling to be voted on immediately. Known as the Loeb rule, it prohibited teachers from belonging to: 1) any labor-connected organization or 2) any group whose executive officers were not teaching at the present time. The board approved it, some because of Loeb's autocratic control and others because business interests compelled it.[54]

When Mrs. Young returned there was little she could do. Her December retirement was eminent

and her authority was similar to that of a lame duck president. All teachers had received contracts with clauses pertaining to the new rulings. They had to be signed before the first paycheck was received. Mrs. Young tried to get some recommendations for promotions approved. Loeb and the board refused approval until the contracts were signed. CTF Attorney Greenacre secured an injunction so that by October the board was prohibited from enforcing such a ruling. Haley went to work to secure a tenure protection bill in the meantime.[55] So CTF opposition was held at bay until Young retired in December. Before she left town, however, she warned the teachers that the opposition was not over, it was just laying dormant. In Spring 1916 under Superintendent Shoop, board President Loeb refused to issue contracts to 68 teachers for the following year.[56]

VI

> The Progressives assumed--they were compelled to assume if they believed in progress--that the free individual will exercise his creative power in accordance with moral principles. They looked upon man as a progressive being in whom intelligence and virtue are slowly gaining the ascendency over animal impulses.

As it turned out all 68 teachers were reinstated by fall 1917 due to the passage of the tenure bill which the CTF had sponsored. But by then, Young had made her residence in Los Angeles, written articles about progressive education wherever she found it, and finally joined the work of the liberty loan committee--work she was involved with when she succombed to the Spanish-strain of influenza in October 1918.[57]

Even in her retirement years she kept faith in the good will of the teachers. She presented a paper at the NEA meeting in July 1916. Who should precede her but Jacob Loeb, defending his stand against teachers' unions. When she heard this she discarded her prepared speech and answered his criticisms. She said "no person should ever be on a board of education who does not send his own children, or did not send them while they were of school age, to the public schools." Loeb's children attended private schools. She, with a defense of the CTF, said:

> In Chicago--I might as well say Chicago outright; you know that what has been said referred to Chicago--as a district superintendent I saw the beginnings of the Chicago Teachers' Federation, and I felt very uneasy; I feared those teachers were becoming too grasping--else why were they organizing the federation, independent of the superintendent and the board of education? I was not large enough in the beginning to see, I had not the insight to see, that these women were realizing that they had not the freedom, the power, which people should have who are to train the minds of children. They came into the committee (I used to attend the meetings of the Committee on School-Management when I was a district superintendent), and askt that the board consider increasing their salaries. I can see that committee now, as they sat there and

listened calmly, with immovable, expressionless faces. When all had spoken, the chairman askt whether there were any more to speak. There were no more; hence they were dismist; and then the smile that went around that table! They had had their say. I don't know whether you take that situation in fully or not. The result was--nothing! And again they came, and the same courteous reception and the same dismissal and the same nothing! And after a while they said, "This is silly."

When they were affiliated with the Labor Union I was sorry. I thought they had made a great mistake, and I said publicly that I thought it was a mistake, and on general principles I would be willing to make that statement today. But what affected my general principles and brought me down to something special? It was this. They found that in order to get anything done they must have voting power behind them. And they found that the people, the men, in their own station and rank in life, the college-bred men, were not ready to do anything for them; therefore they were compelled to go in with those who had felt the oppression and the grind of the power of riches. That is why they went into the Federation of Labor . . . .

I am very sorry--I had no idea that I should hear the teachers of Chicago attackt as they have been, and if the reader of that paper had workt in those schools, or if he had gone thru those schools, or if he had patronized those schools, he could not so attack these teachers.

I desire to make one more point. In every body of people there will always develop two parties. It is for the good of the nation that we have the radical and the conservative. It is for the good of any organization that there be two parties, but not necessarily factions. But what are you going to do if bitterness is developt? And what develops bitterness? That is the question. There is evidence and report of great bitterness between some members of the board and the teachers. That bitterness originated in the class antagonism, developt by the teachers in bringing wealthy tax-dodgers under the law. It has no basis in the classroom. I believe--and I have visited the schools of almost every large and middle-sized city and town in this country--I believe that nowhere does there exist a clearer vision of the aim of the public schools, and nowhere is there more life than indicates the conduct of the work in harmony with that vision than in the city of Chicago.[58]

In 1918 at her last NEA meeting the teachers and administrators returned her support by standing in silent ovation when she entered the meeting to speak. To those educators who worked with her and knew her she remained in the words of one such person, "the 'great commoner' among the educators--a most thorough democrat" who, to quote Jane Addams, "had more general intelligence and character than any other woman I knew."[59]

NOTES

1. All bold faced quotations introducing each section come from Ralph Henry Gabriel's COURSE OF AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC THOUGHT (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940), pp. 331-340. It remains one of the most insightful overviews of the Progressive Era. For more recently written descriptions of this period see Eric F. Goldman, RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952); Carl Resek, ed., THE PROGRESSIVES (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967); John D. Buenker, URBAN LIBERALISM AND PROGRESSIVE REFORM (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973); Louis Filler, PROGRESSIVISM AND MUCKRAKING (New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1976).

2. The biographical data on Young is taken from John T. McManis, ELLA FLAGG YOUNG AND A HALF-CENTURY OF THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS (Chicago: A.C. McClurg and Co., 1916), pp. 15-100.

3. Haley autobiography, 1934-35, precedes Version IV, p. 8, Boxes 32-34, Chicago Teachers' Federation Files, Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Illinois.

4. Little is known of William Young except that he was not well and died several years after their marriage.

5. McManis, p. 61.

6. Joseph M. Rice, THE PUBLIC - SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES (New York: The Century Co., 1893), pp. 166-192.

7. McManis, p. 117.

8. For accounts of the early years of the Chicago Teachers' Federation and effect Young's resignation had, see Boxes 1, 32-34, Chicago Teachers' Federation Files; for Young's later assessment of the CTF, see Young, "A Reply [to Jacob Loeb]," JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION HELD AT NEW YORK CITY, JULY 1-8, 1916 54(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916), p. 359, note the "reformed" simplified spelling; Department of Public Instruction. City of Chicago. PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1899 (Chicago: Hack and Anderson, 1900), p. 654.

9. McManis, pp.119-122. For another account of their association, see Joan K. Smith "The Influence of Ella Flagg Young on John Dewey's Educational Thought." REVIEW JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE (Summer 1977).

10. Gay Wilson Allen, WILLIAM JAMES: A BIOGRAPHY (New York: The Viking Press, 1967), pp. 435-36 citing James to Schiller, 8 April 1903.

11. For a description of her normal principalship see McManis pp. 123-143; Mary Agnes Riley, "A History of the Chicago Normal School: 1856-1906 (M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1914) pp.157-60; Joseph Reim, "The Contributions to Education of Ella Flagg Young" (M.E. thesis, Chicago Teachers College, 1940), pp. 9-11; and Rosemary Donatelli. "The Contributions of Ella Flagg Young to the Educational Enterprise" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago Microfilms, T22517, 1971). pp. 201-78. Quoted material from her work is taken from Ella Flagg Young, "Scientific Method in Education" in THE DECENNIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1303), pp. 141-155.

12. For an account of the tax fight, see Joan K. Smith, "Progressivism and the Teacher Union Movement: A Historical Note," EDUCATIONAL STUDIES 7(Spring 1976): 44-61. See also Haley autobiography, 1910, version I and 1911, Version II, pp. 1-117.

13. For information regarding Cooley's and the school board's practices toward teachers, see Robert Reid, "The Professionalization of Teachers: The Chicago Experience, 1895-1920" (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1969; Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 69-1918); Olive Orton Anderson, "The Chicago Teachers' Federation," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1908); Domenic Candeloro, "The Chicago School Board Crisis of 1907," JOURNAL OF THE ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY 60(November, 1975); Haley autobiography, 1911, Version II; and the CTF BULLETINS for the years 1902-1908 in the CTF Files.

14. Haley autobiography, 1911, Version II, pp. 111-112; CTF BULLETIN 2(14 November 1902).

15. Haley autobiography, 1911, Version II, pp. 165-168.

16. Candeloro, pp. 398-99; CHICAGO TRIBUNE, 3 December 1906, p. 9, col. I. See also CTF BULLETIN 5(19 October 1906): 1-4; 5 (16 November 1906): 1; 6 (7 December 1906): 1; and 6 (14 December 1906): 1-3.

17. Haley autobiography, 1911, Version II, pp. 173-201; CTF BULLETIN 6(4 October 1907): 1-2.

18. Louis F. Post, "Revolutionary School Proceedings," THE PUBLIC 10(1907): 176. Busse had sent police to each of their homes with letters of resignation. They later attended the board meeting on May 27, but it was adjourned because there was no quorum. Board of Education. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 1906 - 1907 (Chicago: Jones Stationers, 1907), pp. 1114-16; CTF BULLETIN 7(May-June 1908); "Art Institute is Flayed by Cooley," THE DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 14 January 1908, p. 3, col. 5; "Cooley in Hot Note Flays Art Institute," THE CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 14 January 1908, p. 3, col. 1. As normal principal Mrs. Young also signed the communication dropping the Institute; "Cooley Will Step Out," THE CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, p. 9, col.6; "Cooley Quits; Resignation is Sent to Board," THE DAILY INTER-OCEAN, p. 1, col. 5.

19. See for example "A Woman Head of Schools," NEW YORK TIMES, 30 July 1909, p. 1.

20. "Mrs. Young at Helm Guiding City Pupils," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 3 August 1909, p. 3, col. 1; "The Woman Chicago Needed," THE INDEPENDENT 77(19 January 1914): 96.

21. FIFTY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1910 (Chicago: Board of Education, 1910), pp. 11-100; Olive Hyde Foster, "Mrs. Ella Flagg Young Teacher, Woman, Friend," HARPER'S BAZAAR 45(April 1911): 174; Helen C. Bennett, AMERICAN WOMEN IN CIVIC WORK (New York: Dodd Mead and Company, 1915), pp. 255-57; "Thousands to Greet Ella Flagg Young," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 29 May 1910, p. 1, col. 5.

22. FIFTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT, pp. 89-91. Further accounts of accomplishments are taken from her annual reports for the years ending June 30, 1911, 1912, and 1913.

23. FIFTY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT, p. 85.

24. "Plan Penny Lunch for Public Schools," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 9 November 1910, p. 3, col. 2; "Penny Lunch Billow," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 12 November 1910, p. 3, col. 2.

25. Accounts of her NEA Presidency appear in Haley autobiography, 1934-35, Version IV, pp. 95-103; The National Education Association, JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES OF THE FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETINGS . . . 1910, pp. 31-50; Edgar B. Wesley, NEA: THE FIRST HUNDRED YEARS (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957), pp. 285-290; 325-330.

26. Catharine Goggin to Margaret Haley, 9 February 1912, Box 41, Folder 3, CTF Files.

27. Carter H. Harrison to Young, 1 July 1912 and Young to Harrison, 8 July 1912, Carter H. Harrison Papers, Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois.

28. "Picks School Aids," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 23 July 1912, p. 3, col. 2; "Names $11,073,000 for School Needs," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 24 January 1913, p. 3, col. 3; Haley autobiography, 1934-35, Version IV, pp. 315-16; 339-40.

29. "School Trustees Are Denounced by Mrs. Young," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 20 December 1912, p. I, col. 1; Mrs. Young Is Again Named Chief," ibid., 12 December 1912, p. 3, col. 4; "Re-Elect Mrs. Young," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 12 December 1912, p. 7, col. 2.

30. See Haley autobiography, 1934-35, Version IV, pp. 343-50; 446-50; PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR, 1912-1913, pp. 1085-86; Box 41, Folder 6, CTF Files; and daily accounts in the DAILY INTER-OCEAN and CHICAGO RECORD HERALD during the months of April and May 1913 for information regarding their pension struggles.

31. Mimeographed copy from the minutes of the Board of Trustees of the Pension Fund, 23 April 1913, pp. 18-23, Box 41, Folder 6, CTF Files.

32. FIFTY-NINTH ANNUAL REPORT, pp. 121-25; her Ph.D. dissertation was published as "Isolation in the School," CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1901): 7-111.

33. See daily newspaper accounts for June and July 1913; Haley autobiography, 1934-35, Version IV, pp. 296; 336; 573.

34. "Three Reasons Why Illinois Women Won the Vote First," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 6 July 1913, p. 3; "Mrs. Young to ResignBoard Members Hear," ibid., 24 July 1913, p. 2, col. 3; "Mrs. Young Quits as School Head to Insure Peace," ibid., 25 July 1913, p. 1, col. 3; PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 1912-1913, p. 102; "Mrs. Young Quits as School Head; Politics Cause," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 25 July 1913, p.1, col. 7.

35. "Mrs. Young May Reconsider Her Decision to Quit," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 26 July 1913, p.1, col. 7.

36. "Mrs. Young Will Remain as School Head," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 30 July 1913, p. 1, col. 3; "School Board May Act on Resignation Today" CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 30 July 1913, p. 3, col. 1; "Mrs. Young to Stay as Head of Schools," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 31 July 1913, p. 1, col. 4; "Mrs. Young Is Boss," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 6 September 1913, p. 5, col. 2.

47. "Stenographic Report of the Public Mass Meeting Held at the Auditorium Theatre, Chicago, Saturday Morning, December 13, 1913," copy of a report in Box 42, October-December 1913 Folder, 47 pp., CTF Files; "Politics Costs Mrs. Young's Place, Avers Sonsteby," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 15 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7.

48. "Board Opens War on School Union," CHICAGO HERALD, 24 August 1915, p. 12, col. 1.

49. "Mayor Names Two Supporters of Mrs. Young," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 23 December 1913, p.1, col. 3; "Mayor Appoints 5 New Trustees to School Board," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 18 December 1913, p.1, col. 7; "Mrs. Young to Be back in Office in Week, Is Rumor," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 17 December 1913, p. 1, col. 5; "Mrs. Young Sure of 14 Votes in Tuesday Meeting," ibid., 20 December 1913, p.1, col. 3; "School Board Members to Hear Mayor's Talk," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 20 December 1913, p. 2, col. 1.

50. PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 1913-1914, pp. 581-585; "Mrs. E. F. Young Is Reinstated; Shoop to Fight," DAILY INTER -OCEAN , 24 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7.

51. "Mrs. Young at Old Post; Shoop Is Her Assistant," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 28 December 1913, p. 3, col. 1. See "School Trustees Give in to Foell," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 5 May 1914, p. 1, col. 5 for seating of ousted members.

52. "Mrs. Young Clashes with J. J. Sonsteby," ibid., 1 April 1914, p. 3, col. 4.

53. "Crowd Protests School Pay Cut," CHICAGO HERALD, 12 May 1915, p. 6, col. 1; "School Blunder Causes Trouble," ibid., 23 April 1915, p. 18, col. 3; "Blames Board for School Woes," ibid., 8 June 1915, p. 9, col. 1.

54. "Federation Rain, Boards' Object," ibid., 4 September 1915, p. 16, col. 2; Albertine Raven to Young, 29 July 1916, Box 45, Folder 3, CTF Files.

55. "Teachers Await Move by Board," CHICAGO HERALD, 24 September 1915, p. 4, col. 1.

56. Margaret Haley to Mrs. MacMahon, 16 June 1916, Box 45, Folder 2, CTF Files.

57. Young, "Los Angeles Schools Ten Years in Advance of Times," JOURNAL OF EDUCATION 83(24 February 1916): 199; "Ella F. Young Dies in Service of Her Country." CHICAGO TRIBUNE, 27 October 1918, p. 9, col. 1.

37. PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 1913-1914, pp. 573-74.

38. "Mrs. Young Quits as School Head; Shoop Succeeds," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 11 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7.

39. "Ella F. Young Is Compelled to Quit Office," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 11 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7.

40. A Chicago Teacher, "The Chicago Board of Education and the Teachers' Federation," SCHOOL AND SOCIETY 2 (16 October 1915): 565-68; Elsie May Smith, "Findings of the New Chicago School Census," JOURNAL OF EDUCATION 76 (29 August 1912): 209-10; A Chicago Teacher, p. 566; "310,000 End Vacation; School Begins Today," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 2 September 1913, p. 1, col. 6; and "Many City Children Lack School Chance," ibid., 6 October 1913, p. 3, col. 7.

41. "Ella F. Young Is Compelled to Quit," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 11 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7; Mrs. Young Quits as School Head; Shoop Succeeds," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 11 December 1913; "Demand Return of Ella F. Young as School's Head," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 11 December 1913, p. I, col. 7.

42. "Mrs. Young Quits Fight as Friends Rally to Her Aid," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 12 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7; "Mayor Ousts Five Board Members in School Crisis,"CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 13 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7.

43. "Reinberg to Aid Move to Return Mrs. E. F. Young," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 15 December 1913, p. 2, col. 2.

44. "Demand Return of Ella F. Young as School's Head," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 12 December 1913, p. I, col. 7.

45. "Reinberg to Aid Move . . . ," DAILY INTER-OCEAN ,15 December 1913.

46. "Demand Return of Ella F. Young . . . ," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 12 December 1913; "Mayor Ousts Five Trustees; Mrs. Young May Reconsider," DAILY INTER-OCEAN, 13 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7; "Ousted Trustees Write to Mayor They Will Fight," ibid., 14 December 1913, p. 1, col. 5. "Protest Raise for Mrs. Young; Harding Hissed," CHICAGO RECORD HERALD, 14 December 1913, p. 1, col. 7.

58. Young, "A Reply [to Jacob Loeb]," JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, p. 359.

59. "Ella F. Young Dies . . . ," CHICAGO TRIBUNE, 27 October 1918.